

DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 302 595

UD 025 659

TITLE A Study of Effective and Ineffective Practices in Chapter 1 Programs for Junior High School Students. Progress Report. June 1986.

INSTITUTION Los Angeles Unified School District, Calif. Research and Evaluation Branch.

PUB DATE Jun 86

NOTE 69p.

PUB TYPE Reports - Evaluative/Feasibility (142)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC03 Plus Postage.

DESCRIPTORS *Compensatory Education; *English Instruction; Federal Programs; Instructional Materials; Junior High Schools; *Junior High School Students; Program Development; Program Evaluation; Secondary School Teachers; Staff Development; *Teacher Effectiveness; *Teacher Evaluation; Teaching Methods; Teaching Styles

IDENTIFIERS *Education Consolidation Improvement Act Chapter 1; Los Angeles Unified School District CA

ABSTRACT

This report describes the activities and research directions taken during the second year of an anticipated four-school-year study that attempts to identify effective instructional practices in Chapter 1 junior high schools in Los Angeles (California). The report is divided into four sections. Section 1 reviews the purposes of the study and clarifies the research questions that are to be addressed. Section 2 describes the research activities of the 1985-86 school year, and discusses some tentative findings. The class activities of 48 teachers, six in each of eight selected Chapter 1 junior high schools, were observed over a two-day period. In the classes observed, teaching proceeded very much like office management, i.e., as a matter of assigning and supervising instructional "jobs." A relatively narrow range of teaching strategies and materials were used in the lessons observed; however, there was a wide range of teaching proficiency. Section 3 describes the staff training activities and assesses the progress made. Section 4 outlines future plans for the study. Appendices present the following: (1) examples of the classroom lessons observed; (2) training manual for the study team; and (3) protocols used by the study team. (BJV)

* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *

ED302595

7-7-89

A STUDY OF EFFECTIVE AND INEFFECTIVE PRACTICES IN CHAPTER 1
PROGRAMS FOR JUNIOR HIGH SCHOOL STUDENTS

PROGRESS REPORT
JUNE 1986

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS
MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Floraline Stevens

LA Unified School Dist.

RESEARCH & EVALUATION BRANCH

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES
INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

LOS ANGELES UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT

UP025659

A STUDY OF EFFECTIVE PRACTICES IN CHAPTER 1 PROGRAMS
FOR JUNIOR HIGH SCHOOL STUDENTS

Progress Report
June 1986

A Progress Report Prepared for the
Research and Evaluation Branch
of the
LOS ANGELES UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT

LOS ANGELES UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT

HARRY HANDLER
Superintendent

This report was prepared by

Don Dorr-Bremme, Ed.D.
Ward Keesling, Ph.D.
Nicolma King, Ed.D.

in cooperation with the
Research and Evaluation Branch, Compensatory Education Evaluation Unit
Los Angeles Unified School District

APPROVED:

Floraline I. Stevens
Director
Research and Evaluation Branch

Table of Contents

Introduction	1
I. A Review of the Study and Pertinent Research Questions	2
II. Some Impressions of Junior High English Teaching	9
III. Staff Training	22
IV. Next Steps in the Study: 1986-87 School Year	28
Appendix A: Examples of the Lessons Observed	35
Appendix B: Training Manual	53
Enclosures: Protocols Used by the Study Team	59

A STUDY OF EFFECTIVE PRACTICES IN CHAPTER 1 PROGRAMS FOR
JUNIOR HIGH SCHOOL STUDENTS

Progress Report
June 1986

Introduction

This report describes the activities and research directions taken during the second year of an anticipated four-school-year study that attempts to identify effective instructional practices in Chapter 1 junior high schools. The study is a follow-on to the previous study, Effective and Ineffective Practices in Chapter 1 Elementary Schools, (October 1984)*. The activities described herein were accomplished by the staff of the school district's Research and Evaluation Compensatory Education Unit and members of the External Planning Team attached to that unit. The activities of this phase of the study took place from September 1985 to June 1986.

This progress report will be divided into four sections. First, we will review the purposes of the study and clarify the research questions we propose to answer. The second section will describe the research activities of this year and discuss some tentative findings. The third section will describe the staff training activities and our assessment of the progress made. In the fourth, we will discuss future plans for the study.

*Los Angeles Unified School District Research and Evaluation Branch Publication No. 450, by Don Dorr-Bremme, J. Ward Keesling, and Nicelma King.

I. A REVIEW OF THE STUDY AND PERTINENT RESEARCH QUESTIONS

As mentioned earlier, this study is a follow-up to an earlier study which identified certain instructional practices that seemed associated with effective instruction in Chapter 1 elementary schools. While the study was not exhaustive, it was quite intensive, and it utilized ethnographic research methods to study teaching practices and teacher-student interaction in the classroom. At the conclusion of the study, several staff members of the school district, including Dr. Floraline Stevens, Director of the Research and Evaluation Branch, and Mrs. Pauline Hopper, Associate Superintendent for Compensatory Education Programs, were quite interested in what a similar study might identify for junior and senior high schools.

Because of staffing and funding constraints, we deemed it unfeasible to concentrate on both junior and senior high schools, so the study to date has focused solely on junior high schools with Chapter 1 programs. To address the central objective of identifying effective classroom practices in the junior high schools, we began with broad on-site and district-wide inquiries about the nature of Chapter 1 programs in junior high schools. During this phase, the research team visited each Chapter 1 junior high school in the district and interviewed knowledgeable staff members about the school, its demographics, programs, and the specific nature of its Chapter 1 services. This was the essential activity of the study's first year, ending in June 1985. At the conclusion of this process, we retained our initial research question, "What organizational or instructional practices are effective for Chapter 1 students in junior high schools?" In addition, we had some preliminary answers to related questions:

- What are the goals of the Chapter 1 programs in the junior high schools?
- What types of students are served in these programs?
- What is the nature of the services provided in the programs?
- What is the background and experience level of the service providers?
- What is the grade level of the students served by the program?
- How are Chapter 1 services articulated with the regular instructional program?

During the first year of the study, we utilized the interview protocol included in this report as Enclosure A. In this examination, we generally found that there were small school-to-school differences in the nature of Chapter 1 services, with most schools focusing on improving the achievement of students in the basic skills, principally reading, language arts, and mathematics. Students served were basically those who were targeted by the Chapter 1 Program because of lower than average achievement for their grade level. The basic Chapter 1 services included the provision of aides, and in almost all schools, some type of laboratory setting for specialized small group or individual instruction. Since the schools under study are so heavily saturated with Chapter 1 students, virtually all of the teachers in these schools could be termed "Chapter 1 teachers". As a result, no systematic differences were observed between the providers of Chapter 1 and regular instructional programs. Students at all grade levels received Chapter 1 services, and most of the schools used the same or similar materials for Chapter 1 and non-Chapter 1 instruction.

The primary differences reported appear to be in pacing and remediation. We are not sure if this is because of the different instructional needs of students and the district-wide mandate to provide grade-level appropriate instruction. It is also possible that more (or less) review might be a feature of school-to-school differences in instructional philosophy. At any rate, it would appear from our preliminary interviews that the regular program and the Chapter 1 program were fully integrated.

From this preliminary examination of the Chapter 1 junior high schools, we identified a number of researchable questions to be answered during the 1985-86 school year. In addition, it was important that the teacher advisors develop and refine their skills for doing the kind of ethnographic study we believe this project will require. Thus, project activities during the 1985-86 school year centered on the following questions:

- How can we select schools that will provide us with the greatest likelihood of observing instructional excellence and ethnic/programmatic diversity for Chapter 1 schools?
- Can we nominate three outstanding and three average teachers at each school, and thereby develop an understanding of the type of instruction prevalent in Chapter 1 programs?
- Are there particular training exercises that will help our team of teacher advisors to acquire the level of competence needed to complete this ethnographic type of study?
- Are there specific patterns of instruction with these teachers/schools?
- Can any of these teachers be identified as "outstanding", either from our observation and discussion, or from independent ratings by experts in the LAUSD?

The work of the study team during the 1985-86 school year focused on these questions, and the sections of this progress report that follow will describe our findings to date.

Description Of The Selection Process And Preliminary Findings

Selection of Schools

Schools to be involved in the study were identified through a two-step process. First, the study team interviewed knowledgeable respondents in the school district about the schools they felt represented the best opportunities for understanding the instructional issues involved in Chapter 1 schools. From these knowledgeable, we identified a list of Chapter 1 junior high schools that many experts in LAUSD felt were most successful in their Chapter 1 programs. We compiled this list and kept it in mind for the second step of the school selection process.

The second step of the process involved specific consideration of the Chapter 1 schools themselves. Because of the diversity of the schools in the LAUSD, the study team believed it was important to sample from Chapter 1 junior high schools with a variety of ethnic compositions, and from schools that represented some variety in their recent demographic and achievement profiles. Although research findings on the relationship of ethnicity to test scores has been indecisive, we felt it was important to distinguish between the Chapter 1 schools in the study that were predominantly Hispanic and those that were predominantly Black. Since virtually all of the Chapter 1 junior high schools in the district are either predominantly Black, predominantly Hispanic, or some combination of both. Asians, Native Americans and Anglos are represented at much lower levels of concentration among Chapter 1 junior high schools. As a result, we sought schools that represented the dominant ethnic compositions represented by the Chapter 1 program.

We also sought schools that scored higher and lower than the majority of

Chapter 1 schools on the Comprehensive Tests of Basic Skills (CTBS) in 1983. This we felt was important to understand the range of instructional issues facing schools that have different achievement histories. If, for example, a school had long been regarded as a "good" school by the community and the staff, it is possible that there would be some systematic difference in the instructional practices of teachers from the school that was regarded as "average" or "marginal". In addition, our preliminary interviews revealed that some school personnel preferred not to be involved in the study and we respected their wishes. In the interests of obtaining an ethnically diverse group of higher and lower scoring schools to study, we selected the distribution of schools reflected in Table 1.

Table 1

Schools to be Studied in Study of Chapter 1 Junior High Schools

Ethnicity	1983 CTBS Reading Scores	
	<u>Higher</u>	<u>Lower</u>
70% Hispanic	Piedmont* Nacimiento	Vista
70% Black	London Mott	Freedman
Ethnically Mixed		Galileo* Patria*

*Year-round schools

The selected schools were contacted early in the fall of 1985, and their participation in the study was confirmed. The study team reviewed the preliminary interviews with schools and determined that at the junior high school level, services focused on English/Language Arts programs. Because of the departmentalized nature of instruction at the junior high level, we decided to focus our attention on the English/Language Arts programs.

During the fall semester of 1985, the Research and Evaluation teacher advisors contacted the English Department chairperson and Chapter 1 coordinators at the selected schools. Their purpose was to identify (from the perspective of each respondent) 3 "average" and 3 "outstanding" English/Language Arts teachers in each school. A copy of the interview protocol is included as Enclosure B. In these interviews, respondents were asked not to distinguish the "average" teachers from the "outstanding" teachers. The team simply accepted the recommendations and compiled lists of recommended teachers.

Typically the English Department Chairperson or the Chapter 1 Coordinator was regarded as more knowledgeable about the operation of the instructional program as it related to Chapter 1. Sometimes, this was because one respondent or the other had been at the school for a longer period of time. In other instances, greater familiarity with the English/Language Arts program was the result of more direct involvement in the program. The study team, to allow for school-to-school differences, was willing to make case-by-case judgments about which respondent was more knowledgeable. In five of the junior high schools selected, the English/Language Arts Department Chairperson was identified as the most knowledgeable about the instructional program. At two of the schools, the Chapter 1 coordinator was regarded as most

knowledgeable. At one school, neither respondent was regarded as more knowledgeable than the other.

The research team believed that the most effective teachers were more likely to be nominated more than once e.g., by the more knowledgeable respondent and by the less knowledgeable respondent. As a result, they would be mentioned more frequently. We also believed that there would be more disparity on "average" teachers -- that is, they would be mentioned less frequently, and more of them would be mentioned. Since we wanted to select 3 "outstanding" and 3 "average" teachers in each school, it was relatively simple to select among those nominated.

The study team had a reasonable level of success in actually observing the staff selected using this system at Piedmont, Patria, London, and Freedman, where all of the originally designated teachers were available and agreed to be observed. At Galileo and Nacimiento, 5 out of 6, or 83% at each school were available. At Mott, 3 of 6, or 50% were available, and at Vista, 2 of 6 or 33% were available. This means that of the original 48 teachers selected for observation, 39 or 81% were actually observed. In those cases where the originally selected teacher was not available, or indicated a strong preference not to be observed, replacement teachers were selected from the original list of recommendations or from the roster of available English/Language Arts teachers.

Teachers were observed between March and June, 1986. Research and Evaluation teacher advisors were primarily responsible for the observations, with input and guidance from the External Planning Team. Observations were planned for two consecutive class periods, and were conducted after the teacher advisors had been through a training period designed to enhance their skills in ethnographic observation.

II. SOME IMPRESSIONS OF JUNIOR HIGH ENGLISH TEACHING

As noted earlier in this report, a total of 48 teachers, 6 in each of the eight selected Chapter 1 junior highs, were observed during the 1985-86 school year. The observations took place as the teachers worked with the same students in the same class period across two successive school days. Thus, 96 periods were observed in all.

Given the selection procedures already described, roughly half of these teachers appeared to be well above average in their teaching proficiency, while half appeared to be average. Recall that the nomination of teachers as "outstanding" and "average" was done blindly; the research team had no way of knowing which of the 48 teachers had been nominated as "outstanding."

The purpose of these observations was threefold:

- (1) to determine whether the pool of outstanding English teachers in Chapter 1 schools seemed sufficient to warrant continuation of the present study; and assuming it was,
- (2) to gather descriptions that would help in identifying a small number of potentially outstanding teachers for further, more extensive and detailed study (as well as a set of average teachers for contrastive observations); and simultaneously,
- (3) to provide training experience for the team's teacher advisors, as described in the section on training.

In view of these purposes, what follows should not be construed as firm results or research "findings," but rather as a set of interpretive "impressions."

These impressions are offered with two goals in mind. The first goal is to report the progress that has been made with regard to (1) and (2) above: locating an adequate number of outstanding teachers for continued study. The second goal is to report the research team's impressions of what is occurring in some Chapter 1 junior high English classes.

A contrastive study of effective and ineffective classroom practices depends upon the existence of a substantial number of especially effective teachers. Rumor in many districts has it that the better teachers gravitate toward the "best" schools and get the "best" classes, i.e., those with the higher-achieving students. Less-adept instructors (or beginning teachers), it is often said, wind up with lower-achieving groups. One purpose of this year's data collection, therefore, was to answer two very basic questions: "Are there any truly excellent teachers in Chapter 1 junior high English classrooms?" and "Are there enough to warrant continuation of the study with its present design?"

At this point, the answer to both of these questions seems to be "Yes." Our impression is that among those providing instruction in Chapter 1-junior high English classes, there is in fact a small pool of especially effective or "outstanding" teachers.

To arrive at this judgment, each member of the research team set out to identify any teacher she or he deemed worthy of further consideration as especially effective. No common, "scientific" criteria were established for making these selections. Instead, each team member simply used his or her own, personal, intuitive and common-sense notions of what constitutes good teaching. After the selections had been independently made, it became

apparent that the researchers had considered such factors as evidence of careful planning, of good organization and classroom management, or creativity and the use of a variety of resources beyond basic texts, of consistency and enthusiasm, and of active student involvement in the learning process.

In the case of the teacher advisors, selections were made from among the 16 teachers each had directly observed. From among their sets of 16, two of the advisors identified four teachers as especially promising for inclusion in the "outstanding" group; the third named three of the sixteen observed. (Two advisors also chose to mention a second tier of teachers, those who seemed to be good but not actually outstanding. One placed five additional teachers in this category; the other, four.)

The members of the EPT identified potentially outstanding candidates from among the entire group of 48 teachers observed. Since time permitted the EPT to visit only a few classrooms, each made his/her selections based on the written lesson descriptions produced by the teacher advisors. One EPT member selected five of the 48 teachers for possible inclusion in the "outstanding" pool, while another chose 6 of the 48.¹ It is worth noting that those teachers identified by the EPT were in nearly every case also named by a teacher advisor, indicating agreement among members of the research team.

These individual, impressionistic judgments will not in themselves determine the final set of potentially outstanding teachers to be studied in depth. The evaluations of an "expert panel" chosen from within the District

¹The third EPT member was responsible for and occupied with another aspect of the project when the entire set of lesson descriptions were reviewed for this purpose.

will be weighed heavily; we will look for consensus in the ratings of both panel members and members of the research team. The possibility of using test scores and/or other indicators in selecting the final pool of teachers is also being considered. Nevertheless, the numbers given here are important in one respect. They suggest that we will in fact be able to find a pool of outstanding or demonstrably effective teachers to study. Such teachers appear to be a minority, but not an anomaly, in Chapter 1 junior high English classes.

While the research team was able to identify a small pool of very impressive teachers for further study, its work this year also provided an initial sense of what "average" teaching looks like in Chapter 1 junior high English classes, as well as a view of how widely teaching practices and proficiency vary around this norm. The sections that follow describe these impressions. In doing so, they help to elaborate the criteria that the researchers used in nominating potentially outstanding teachers.

The Norm: Teaching as Office Management

In the typical, "average" class observed, teaching proceeded very much like office management. It was as though the teachers thought, "These classroom materials contain tasks that need to be done. The job of this class is to complete these grammar exercises, to read and answer questions about these stories, to cover these vocabulary and spelling lists on a weekly basis, etc. My role is to be sure the work gets done adequately and on time."

Whether teachers actually thought in this way is uncertain; but their classroom actions, on the whole, certainly reflected this view. The typical "average" teacher spent most of his or her classroom time assigning, supervising, and giving the answers to various oral and written exercises.

In the overwhelming majority of classes observed, teachers spent surprisingly little time modeling skills and processes or developing concepts and ideas. They spent very little time asking questions that provoked discussion or problem solving, thought or insight. They seldom structured experiences in which students were required to make connections or see larger patterns, to express their feelings or make logical judgments. Indeed, the typical teacher did not ask students to analyze their own errors or correct their own work. Instead, he or she selected tasks from among classroom materials, set deadlines for their completion, and monitored students as they worked. When work was finished, he or she gave (or called on members of the class to give) the correct answers. Then the work was collected (if written), and the group moved on to the next task.

Within a typical class period of 55 minutes, the students often completed three (and sometimes four) tasks in this fashion. For instance, they might spend 15 or 20 minutes reading a story, "go over" some spelling or vocabulary words drawn from a standard alphabetized list, then finish with another quarter hour or so of grammar. Teachers rarely took the opportunity to connect these activities. Some drew vocabulary and/or spelling words from the assigned reading, but many did not. Moreover, only a very few took the opportunity to combine grammar with literature, literature with composition, or current vocabulary and spelling words with grammar exercises. Most often, each topic was treated discretely, independently, in separate exercises.

Day-to-day continuity in lesson topics was usually apparent in that the next day's class picked up where students had left off in their reading, on their seatwork, etc. Nevertheless, the observations seldom turned up evidence of any larger thematic or conceptual continuity in teaching units. For

instance, we rarely heard teachers make explicit or implicit reference to overarching themes, concepts, or skills. In reading a story or play they rarely drew parallels or comparisons with others.

All this served to convey the impression to the researchers -- and perhaps to the students as well -- that each exercise was an end in itself. The message seemed to be that one learned the meaning of vocabulary words in order to pass the test; that one learned to recognize subjects and predicates in order to complete a worksheet or exercise in Warriner's grammar; that one learned to read stories in order to pronounce each word correctly and answer the questions at the end. This impression was reinforced by the fact that the typical assignment did not require students to integrate skills, to apply them conjointly. Nor, in the typical lessons observed did the teacher make any reference to the larger meaning or uses of the skills being taught, to their value, or to their application in "real world" contexts.

It could be argued that the prevalence of teaching as office management -- as assigning and supervising instructional "jobs" -- reflected the time of year. Our observations began in March and continued through June. This is a period when many teachers are conducting review lessons. It is possible that the EPT's impressions of teaching were influenced by gaps in the lesson descriptions. Furthermore, some might maintain that the kind of "cut-and-dried" lessons characterized here are good for Chapter 1 students, on the grounds that they need redundant practice in very basic skills.

Continued study will help to determine whether these arguments have merit. Next year, we hope to observe teachers earlier in the school year. We plan to interview teachers regarding their planning goals and objectives.

More complete observation and description will come with continued experience.

At present, however, the EPT as a whole is disappointed with the norm of pedagogical quality and practices observed in the 48 Chapter 1 junior high English classes. We believe that the data produced this year were quite sufficient to give an accurate general view of classroom activity. We believe that even in review lessons, both teachers and students can be more actively, thoughtfully, creatively, and meaningfully involved in the teaching-learning process than they generally were in these classes. We do recognize that we only visited 48 teachers for two class periods each. However, we strived to pick the schools we visited carefully to optimize the chances of finding good teaching. We worked to pick teachers in a way that would rule out the very weakest. In view of these efforts, imperfect though they were, we had hoped to find "average" teaching at a higher level of proficiency.

A Narrow Range of Teaching Strategies and Materials

As the foregoing account might suggest, a relatively narrow range of teaching strategies and materials were used in the lessons observed. The teacher who created his or her own teaching materials, or brought in materials to supplement basic texts, was exceptional. So, too, was the teacher whose lessons departed from the pattern outlined in the last section.

Literature or reading was taught largely through text anthologies and selections from magazines such as Scope. In general, the emphasis was on short, fictional stories or plays. The class considering poetry, nonfiction, or longer prose pieces was rare. Students frequently took turns reading aloud from the same story; somewhat less often, students read silently in a common

text. Sustained silent reading in books of the individual student's choice was conducted in approximately six of the 48 classrooms, usually on a daily basis and as a "dispatch" activity (one in which the class engaged while the teacher took attendance and did other classroom business.)

Questions on reading assignments called predominantly for literal recall of story details, and they were usually posed in question-answer (or recitation) episodes following a segment of reading. In some cases, however, teachers' reading questions called for inferences, extrapolation, or conclusions. (See Example No. 2 in Appendix A for a lesson characterizing these forms of questioning.) In a very few instances, teachers did pose divergent questions that generated actual discussions of literary works. Only one of two classes, however, gave any attention to literary genres or even the most basic literature concepts such as theme, plot, and characterization.

Grammar was usually taught through standard texts such as Warriner's and others, and/or through published workbooks and worksheets. Individual seatwork was almost always the mode of instruction. In the classes observed, attention focused largely on elemental grammar skills, e.g., recognizing parts of speech; obtaining subject-verb agreement; differentiating comparative and superlative forms; conjugating verbs in the present, past, and present perfect tenses; capitalizing the first word of a sentence or quotation. The overwhelming majority of exercises called for learning at the lower levels of Benjamin S. Bloom's Taxonomy of Educational Objectives, i.e., knowledge (recall) or comprehension.

As mentioned above, correcting these assignments usually was done by simply stating the right answer. Students rarely had to analyze why particular answers were correct or incorrect. Teachers rarely explained the principles underlying the correct answers.

It was the unusual teacher who required something more of her students in grammar. (See Example No. 1 in Appendix A in which the teacher calls for students to assemble scrambled words into syntactically correct sentences with proper punctuation and capitalization. This teacher also calls on the entire class to analyze each sentence, to point out errors, and to volunteer corrections.)

Vocabulary and spelling received a great deal of attention in most of the classes observed. In some instances, word lists were drawn from current reading. More often, they came from lists unrelated to students' other work. The typical pattern was for teachers to give the list of words at the beginning of the week, repeating each word and requiring the class to echo the pronunciation chorally. Some teachers then gave students the definitions of each vocabulary word, while others required students to use dictionaries to find definitions. Some teachers appeared to require practice exercises during the week, e.g., writing each word (or word and definition) five times; using each word appropriately in a sentence; or taking a practice quiz. Finally, a test on the word list came at the end of the week.

It appeared that in many of the classes spelling and vocabulary lists were separate, although in some classes students were required to spell and define the same set of words. Learning vocabulary and spelling always took the form of rote memorization. Tests never required more than correct spelling, writing a single definition, or both. A lesson that required students to incorporate new spelling or vocabulary words into compositions, into class discussion, etc., was observed in only one classroom

Composition or writing instruction was not much in evidence across the 48 classes and 96 lessons observed. Where present, writing assignments took one of two forms.

One form was journal writing. In a few classes, students made daily entries in personal journals, usually for ten minutes or so at the beginning of the class period as the teacher took attendance, dealt with passes, etc. Some teachers assigned a topic for the day's entry, e.g., "what you think of your five-week report card"; "something that makes you proud." Others required students to choose their own topic each day. The teachers' goals for journal writing, as well as their methods of giving students feedback on journal entries, could not be discerned in our observations.

Another form of writing assignment was the traditional composition. Evidence of such compositions (e.g., papers posted on bulletin boards, references to due dates, etc., as well as actual work on composition) was present in roughly seven of the classrooms observed. The assigned length of the compositions was commonly one to several paragraphs, although some required more. Modes of discourse varied from creative narration (a story on "Time Raiders") to description ("tell about a significant elder in your life") to exposition (a book report on the biography of a woman).

Throughout the 1980's the teaching of writing has been a widely discussed topic at all levels in education. The consensus now is that composition should be taught as a process. Teachers should lead students through the stages of "prewriting" thinking and planning, composing a first draft, and then reiterate cycles of editing, revising, and rewriting. "Conferencing" with teachers around an early draft is widely advocated, as is peer review. These approaches, which most believe are accessible to and equally valuable for students of lower achievement, have been widely available in materials and workshops produced by the California Writing Project (formerly the Bay Area

Writing Project; recently extended into a nationwide effort). Unfortunately, however, we saw very little of this approach in the classrooms visited. Few teachers did have students engaged in revising and rewriting activities, and in one lesson, pairs of students were engaged in peer review.

Instruction in other skill areas was also found in the English classes observed. In one class students were developing skills in formulating and stating hypotheses. In another, students were learning how to use the kinds of location directory boards posted in department stores and office buildings. In a third, students spent some time practicing classification skills. In yet another, topics in the history of the English language were being covered.

Similarly, there were exceptions to the predominant modes of instruction. In order to review chapters of a novel, for example, one teacher assigned small groups of students to perform skits or question-and-answer "interviews". Students in another class worked in small groups every day, striving to complete a set of weekly assignments. (The teacher graded each group daily on its collective accomplishments.) In another class studying advertisements, small groups read or dramatized ads for the class to analyze. These approaches, however, were among the few which diverged from the patterns of teaching described in the preceding sections.

A Wide Range Of Teaching Proficiency

The account above began by making the important point that we could identify some potentially outstanding teachers for further study. It continued by describing central tendencies (and some of the variations) in the teaching practices observed. Along the way, it mentioned that the typical teacher played the role of "an office manager," that a limited range of teaching

methods and materials were used, and that departures from these generalizations were rare.

Despite the similarity of methods and materials from classroom to classroom, the research team feels that the teaching observed this year extended across the entire range from "outstanding" to "poor".

In our judgement a distribution of teaching proficiencies would be a steeply sloping, roughly bell shaped curve, skewed to the negative side of the qualitative scale. The middle of this curve would represent the high proportion of teachers assessed as more or less "average" -- teachers who performed their role in the "office manager" fashion. Among this group, some impressed us as somewhat more adept. Their classes were more orderly, more carefully and logically planned; their explanations of assignments tended to be clearer, more thorough; and they demonstrated a somewhat higher degree of enthusiasm and personal interest in their students. Others among this group, for exactly the opposite reasons, came across as somewhat less adept.

At one extreme of the distribution would lie the small number of teachers judged as potentially outstanding. Generally, these teachers were not distinguished by the use of unique or innovative methods. Rather, they generally seemed to be more skilled at developing and executing their lessons, which seemed very well planned and organized. Their classes were friendly, but orderly and productive. Their lessons were presented in a clearer, more careful, and more thorough manner. Perhaps most significantly, they did more than make assignments, set deadlines, supervise, and give answers. They required students to think, analyze, and understand. Their questions challenged students to use critical thinking skills or to see overarching

patterns. They provided encouragement and helped students to see the relevance of class material in life beyond the classroom. These teachers involved students and demonstrated enthusiasm in their teaching.

Finally, at the other end of the distribution were those teachers who, when judged against the norm, seemed extremely ineffective. This number was very small, perhaps smaller than the number that seemed to be outstanding.

Just as those we judged to be average, these teachers enacted their role in "office manager" fashion. They were, however, quite inefficient managers. In some cases, their assignments were difficult to understand; directions were incomplete, unclear, ambiguous. They often failed to maintain a productive classroom environment. In some cases, they gave students work that was clearly too difficult.

The nature of the differences described so briefly here, and of the team's criteria for judgment, can best be conveyed by example. Thus, this report provides descriptions of three sets of lessons. Example No. 1 illustrates the work of a teacher who was nominated for inclusion in the "outstanding" pool. Example No. 2 illustrates instruction that was judged as "average" teaching. Example No. 3 demonstrates teaching at the extreme negative end of the scale. An introduction to each set of lessons, which covers two successive days of observation, explains some reasons for these judgmental labels.

The length of these descriptions would interrupt the coherence and flow of the report at this point, therefore, they have been included as Appendix A at the end. We suggest, however, that readers turn to the lesson descriptions and review them now. Reading them will provide further insight into the research team's impressions of the teaching observed to date.

III. STAFF TRAINING

Staff training was a major focus of this year's work. The goal was to provide the team's three LAUSD teacher advisors with the skills that they would need to describe classroom practices comprehensively in an ethnographic fashion. These skills included observing the complex interplay of teacher-student and student-student interaction; recording those observations comprehensively in descriptive, play-by-play field notes; and transcribing the rough, play-by-play notes into a clear, detailed, narrative description of class activities. The training procedures and their results are described below.

Training Procedures

Training in classroom observation began in early January, 1986, just as site selection tasks were being completed. Procedures generally followed the steps outlined in the Training Manual developed by the External Planning Team (The manual was submitted originally as part of the September, 1985 progress report and is included in this report as Appendix B). Minor adaptations were made in these pre-planned steps to meet advisors' needs and to accommodate the project's revised schedule.¹

As a first step in training, the teacher advisors were assigned to read the class descriptions produced as part of A Study of Effective and Ineffective Practices in Chapter 1 Elementary Schools, Los Angeles Research

¹On schedule revisions, see memo dated October 24, 1985, from the EPT to Dr. Floraline Stevens and David Houck, "Regarding Clarification of Project Objectives for 1985-86."

and Evaluation Branch Publication No. 450. These descriptions were written by teacher advisors who were already trained in the ethnographic observation approach to be used in the current study. Thus, they provided an excellent model for the present staff.

A second reading assignment was the chapter entitled "Observing Ethnographically," in An Introduction to Practical Fieldwork from an Ethnographic Perspective. Developed especially for LAUSD personnel by one member of the EPT, this selection described principles and practical guidelines for observing and taking descriptive field notes.

Through group discussion these readings were reviewed, highlighted, and their main points were elaborated.

Practice observations were the next step in training. Each advisor was asked to complete two practice observations in Chapter 1 English classrooms in junior high schools that would not be part of the actual study. One of these observations was conducted alone and another with an EPT partner observing and taking notes on the same lesson. A subsequent group session provided feedback on the quality of each advisor's rough notes and on his/her final descriptions. Instructive comparisons were drawn between the observations and descriptions of EPT members and three of the advisors.

With this additional instruction as background, the advisors observed two more English classes in non-study schools, took notes, and transcribed these into play-by-play lesson descriptions. EPT members critiqued each of these individually, indicating strengths and weaknesses. Additional group meetings provided pointers for improvement.

These were only initial instructional experiences. Training in observation and description skills continued throughout the data collection period.

During this time, each advisor completed observations and descriptions of 16 teachers for one class period over two successive days: a total of 32 class observations per advisor or a total of 96 observations in all. Periodically, EPT members reviewed the descriptive write-ups produced by the advisors and responded with individual feedback both orally and in writing. During meetings of the entire team, common problems were diagnosed and discussed. General guidelines and specific strategies for improving the comprehensiveness, and clarity of the lesson descriptions were presented. Questions were asked and answered. Telephone calls -- encouraged by EPT members and initiated by the teacher advisors -- provided additional opportunities to discuss specific procedures or problems that emerged.

When nearly all the observations and lesson descriptions had been completed in June, a final cycle of evaluation and feedback was conducted to lay the groundwork for the coming year. EPT members reread each advisor's lesson descriptions in chronological order, from those done first to those done most recently. The idea was to assess the individual's development of ethnographic skills over time. Based on these readings, the EPT identified and distributed a written list of areas in which the advisors' observations and lesson descriptions could be generally improved. The EPT members met with each advisor individually: (1) to provide a brief, summary evaluation of his/her development in ethnographic observation and description skills; and (2) to highlight those areas on the list which he/she particularly needed improvement. The advisors were also directed to review their lesson descriptions and to make appropriate changes and improvements in the time remaining before summer vacation.

The Results of Training

Each teacher advisor made great strides in learning the ethnographic observation and description skills upon which the training centered. Generally speaking, most of the lesson descriptions produced near the end of the observations period, i.e., from mid-May through June, were superior in quality to those generated earlier. In achieving this improvement, the group encountered and, for the most part overcame, a variety of commonly occurring fieldwork problems.

The appropriate combination of comprehensiveness (or completeness) and detail is always difficult to obtain in observing and describing the complex interaction of thirty or forty individuals. In the quest for verbatim description, it is easy to fall behind in one's note taking, with the result that some episodes are described in depth while others are portrayed only sketchily. Focusing on the teacher's words and actions is appropriate, but doing so can lead to overlooking the general activity of the student group as a whole. Additionally, the teachers and students often speak rapidly and/or softly, further complicating the ethnographic process.

Capturing adequate details of the lesson's content is another challenge. Circumstances sometimes make it awkward for a visiting researcher to obtain copies of the materials in use. Sometimes, e.g., in reviewing previous work, class members make only brief and oblique reference to details of the task. The observer's movement to have a look at the books or handouts in question would be disruptive.

Achieving clarity of description is never simple. Once one has observed a lesson, it is difficult to describe events clearly and coherently for a reader

who was not present. What seems cogent to the writer who knows the entire lesson is not always clear to the first-time reader. Maintaining descriptive continuity is also difficult when the write-up of a 55 minute class takes many hours.

Properly separating literal description from judgment and commentary presents additional problems. Recounting activity in behavioral terms, as opposed to summarizing judgmentally or evaluatively, violates our everyday habits.

Keeping track of the time at regular intervals, as well as at key turning points in the lesson, is also difficult. While doing this is critical to assess a teacher's management skills and thoroughness, it is easy for observers to forget time notations amidst all their other responsibilities.

The EPT's experience suggests that these aspects of ethnographic classroom observation are never easily mastered. In this project, they were among those that frequently provided problems. Nevertheless, the teacher advisors made substantial progress towards proficiency in these and related skills, each of which is a prerequisite for successful completion of the study.

Despite this solid progress, our review of the 96 lesson descriptions indicates full proficiency has yet to be attained. Additional training will be required at the outset of the 1986-87 school year. As with most groups of learners in complex subjects, the nature of this training must be varied according to the advisors' progress to date. For some, it will only be a matter of refreshing and fine-tuning skills that are very nearly mastered. For others, a much more extensive and thorough training experience will need to be provided to assure high-quality data.

The teacher advisor's feedback to the EPT, together with the EPT's own

informal evaluation of the past year's work, provides valuable suggestions for future training. Some of the teacher advisors, for example, felt that more frequent and/or more detailed feedback from the EPT would have been an asset. In particular, they felt that they learned a great deal from comparing notes and final descriptions with an EPT member who had observed the same lesson. Comments from the teacher advisors also suggest that getting feedback primarily from one EPT "partner" is less desirable than receiving comments from each EPT member in turn.

In 1986-87 and thereafter, the EPT will strive to incorporate these and other suggestions into their training.

IV. NEXT STEPS IN THE STUDY: 1986-87 SCHOOL YEAR

As the study continues, the next research steps will focus on the following areas:

- (1) Continuation of staff training, including initial orientation and training of any teacher advisors new to the study team.
- (2) Formation of an "expert panel" to assist in narrowing the pool of "outstanding" and "average" teachers for further, contrastive study.
- (3) Screening and rating of teachers in the present pool by the expert panel.
- (4) Observation of and interviews with those teachers selected for further study.
- (5) A second round of screening and rating by both the expert panel and the research team.

Each of these activities is succinctly elaborated in this section. A tentative time line is being developed. It should be noted, however, that the initiation and duration of each activity will depend upon a number of factors. These include the date that a full complement of three teacher advisors become available for project work, their facility for learning ethnographic techniques, and the proportion of their time that they can spend on the study. Other factors will influence the scheduling of panel members, e.g., the willingness of suitable District personnel to serve on the expert panel and the schedules of panel members. Thus, the time line will be refined as necessary to assure the collection of high-quality data in classrooms that will include some potentially outstanding English teachers of seventh and/or eighth grade Chapter 1 students.

Staff Training in 1986-87

Continued data collection will require skills in both ethnographic observation/description and ethnographic interviewing. One staff member has been introduced to both, but her skills will need to be refreshed. In addition, we anticipate that at least two new teacher advisors will be joining the team.

Staff training will recommence as soon as the new teacher advisors are "on board" and available for project work. Training procedures will follow those used in the past. (See description above and the Training Manual in Appendix B.) Strategies to improve training, as described in the previous section of this report, will also be implemented.

We imagine that the continuation of training will be especially intense during October and November. Training for new staff will be facilitated by building on the growing expertise of the experienced teacher advisor, who will be asked to share her accumulated skills and serve as resource person for new team members.

Expert Panel Selection

Our research design incorporates an expert panel made up of District personnel knowledgeable about reading/language arts instruction at the junior high level. Members of the panel will review lesson descriptions gathered last year and determine which teachers are promising candidates for further observation as either "outstanding" or "average."

We anticipate that the panel will include representatives from the following groups: mentor teachers in English, English Department chairpersons in Chapter 1 junior high school, and teacher advisors working with region office Directors of Instruction. District personnel serving other roles

will also be considered before the final selection is made.

In selecting panel members, our chief criteria will be (a) familiarity with English/reading instruction as it actually occurs in Chapter 1 junior high schools; (b) evidence of sensitivity and knowledge in the area of current, effective instructional practices; and (c) interest in the project and willingness to serve within its framework.

To find people with these qualities, we will first solicit recommendations from District personnel at various levels. (We have already identified some candidates during earlier phases of the study.) Promising candidates will be interviewed to determine their familiarity with Chapter 1 schools and classrooms, to assess their levels of knowledge about current instructional theory and practice, and to determine their interest in assisting the study. From the pool of candidates nominated and interviewed, the research team will identify six persons who seem well qualified and willing to serve on the panel.

This process will begin as soon as this progress report has been approved. The selection process will be simultaneous with staff training.

Screening and Rating the Current Pool of Teachers

On a mutually acceptable schedule, panel members will be asked to read a subset of the lesson descriptions that were developed during the past year. The descriptions will be "sanitized" so that teachers and school identifications, judgmental observer impressions, etc., are omitted from the text. We anticipate that the reading and rating of lesson descriptions will be matrixed such that a small number of descriptions will be read and rated by all panel members to assess reliability.

Ratings will result in a narrowed pool of teachers for further study. We anticipate that this pool will number 16 to 24 English teachers of Chapter 1 students in the seventh and/or eighth grade, including both potentially outstanding and average teachers. The exact number of teachers selected, however, will depend upon the panel ratings and on the time available for observation.

Panel members will use their own, intuitive criteria for rating the quality of teaching in the described lessons. The general strategy, however, will be for panel members to place each teacher in one of several qualitative categories, based upon the reading of his/her lesson descriptions. The category labels will be broad: for example, "outstanding," "above average," "average," "below average," and "poor." Panel members will also have the option to indicate that they cannot make a judgment based on data contained in the lesson descriptions. (In this case, detailed feedback on the lesson descriptions will be elicited.)

The expert panel's ratings will be given heaviest weight in selecting the group of seemingly "outstanding" and "average" teachers for further study. To choose this group, both the EPT's and the teacher advisors' independent ratings will also be considered. The goal will be to include those teachers who are rated as "outstanding" by all groups, as well as some teachers consistently rated as "average." (The latter will provide the opportunity for contrastive analysis.)

Once the review and rating process has been completed, we will "debrief" panel members in order to document the criteria they used in rating the teachers.

Data Collection: Observation and Interviews

Data collection in 1986-87 will focus on the teachers chosen through the above process. Purposes and procedures are summarized below.

Purposes

The purpose of the data collection this year will be threefold:

- (1) To help us formulate refined hunches (or hypotheses) about the practices that systematically differentiate "outstanding" from "average" English teachers of Chapter 1 students.
- (2) To help us narrow the pool of teachers still further for a final stage of observation to take place next year. (This last phase of the study in 1987-88 will allow us to test and revise our hunches about the uniquely effective practices of excellent teachers.)
- (3) To help teacher advisors develop and maintain competence in ethnographic skills.

In addition, of course, the data gathered this year will join past and future lesson descriptions in providing a broad and detailed portrait of effective and ineffective practices in Chapter 1 English classrooms.

Methods

To realize these purposes, we will revise and extend the data collection techniques used in the study to date. In particular, we now believe it will be most advantageous to visit classrooms for five successive school days, rather than two successive days as per last year. We expect that two or three of these five daily lessons will be documented in play-by-play detail, with more general descriptions of the remaining days. This should provide a clearer picture of the proportions of time spent on different language arts teaching tasks as well as a sharper portrait of unit organization and

instructional continuity. In addition, the teachers observed will be interviewed semi-formally on a daily basis about their planning practices, goals and objectives, perceptions of the class, etc. This will enable us to place teachers' practices in the context of their own, personal, perceptions and beliefs.

These tentative plans follow from our experiences during last year's research. Before finalizing plans for 1986-87 data collection, however, the EPT will discuss its views with the teacher advisors working on the project, soliciting their suggestions.

Further Screening and Rating

Time permitting, it is possible that the expert panel will be reassembled at the end of the 1986-87 school year for another round of reading and rating. At this time, they will examine and rate the lesson descriptions and other data gathered through the present year, following the same procedures outlined above. New data will also be reviewed and rated by the EPT and the teacher advisors. From these ratings, a final pool of demonstrably outstanding and average teachers will be chosen for study in the final year. Observations and interviews in their classrooms during 1987-88 will serve to confirm and/or refine hunches regarding effective and ineffective classroom practices.

The results of 1986-87 work and plans for concluding the study in 1987-88 will be reported in a progress report to be submitted after the close of the present school year.

APPENDIX A: EXAMPLES OF THE LESSONS OBSERVED

The lesson descriptions on the following pages were adapted from the play-by-play descriptions produced from classroom observation fieldnotes. They are much briefer than the latter, but preserve the sequential flow and essential features of the lessons. The examples were chosen to display the range of teaching quality (as judged by the research team) in the 48, Chapter 1, junior high school English classrooms observed this year.

EXAMPLE NO 1: A TEACHER RATED AS WORTHY OF FURTHER CONSIDERATION
AS "OUTSTANDING"

Introduction:

This example illustrates the work of a teacher whom three members of the team nominated for inclusion in the "outstanding" pool. The setting is a seventh-grade class with 28 Chapter 1 students. The group is working on grammar: constructing sentences with proper capitalization and punctuation from groups of words listed in random order. On the second day of observation, the class continues with this activity then begins to edit and revise a composition that they previously drafted.

These lessons seem well-planned and well-organized. They are accomplished without undue delays and with considerable enthusiasm on both the teacher's and students' part. The teacher manifests concern for the students and their learning, and she attempts to show the students why this material is relevant.

Throughout, the teacher actively engages the students in thinking and problem solving. She gives thorough consideration to each sentence that the students have constructed from the scrambled word lists; she challenges the students to find and correct errors, rather than simply giving them the answers. She involves a high proportion of the class in the critique and discussion of the sentences, both volunteers and nonvolunteers alike.

Furthermore, the content of the lessons calls upon the students to integrate and apply a wide range of grammar skills: appropriate syntax as well as correct spelling, punctuation, and capitalization. Thus, the lessons require much more than simple recall of isolated facts. Finally, when the class turns to a composition assignment, instruction approximates current pedagogical thinking. There is some attention to prewriting planning. There is composing drafts, revising, and rewriting.

THE LESSONS

Day 1:

11:33 As the bell rings, students enter the room. Without prompting, they go directly to the revolving book rack at the back, choose a book, and move to their seats. The entire group reads silently as the teacher takes attendance and works at her desk. The period of silent reading continues uninterrupted for nine minutes.

11:42 "End of reading," says the teacher (T). "Mark the page where you stopped and get out one sheet of paper and a pencil. Everything else off your desk." The students follow these directions promptly and without comment. As they are doing so, the T distributes workbook pages to the first youngster in each row. It is headed "Scrambled Sentences: Exercise 5" and includes numbered clusters of 9 to 16 words to be arranged so as to form a meaningful sentence. While the page is passed back, the T gives the following directions: "You're going to do the left margin [column] from No. 40 to No. 45. Arrange each group in a sentence, following all the rules of capitalization, sentence structure, etc."

11:45 The students quietly begin work. Meanwhile, the teacher walks to the chalkboard and, drawing lines, divides it into five columns -- one for each sentence the students are to construct. She then announces, "Twelve minutes," indicating the time students have left to work on the assignment.

The T begins to walk about the room, approaching and talking with students who raise hands with questions. Occasionally, she prompts students to review their work, e.g., "How many words are in [word set] No. 40?" Student: "Nine." T: "How many do you have [in your sentence]?" The class continues in this fashion -- students silently working, teacher circulating and assisting -- until the assigned time for the task has expired.

12:05 All the students have completed their work, and the T selects 5 students to go to the board. Each does so and constructs a sentence from one of the five assigned word clusters, No. 40 through No. 45 on the workbook page.

Now the T calls on students in the class to check the sentences written on the board, each in turn. In doing so, she asks, "Is it logical? Does it make sense?" When a sentence on the board is done incorrectly, she helps the student who wrote it to make corrections, prompting that student in the group with such questions and comments as, "Do we know what all the words mean? . . . What does rude mean? . . . What part of speech is it? What do adjectives do? . . . Yes, it is correct [in syntax]. Now, what is the grammatical error?" Thus, the review of each sentence is thorough; in a supportive manner, students are challenged to recognize logical and illogical syntax, to identify errors, to correct mistakes. Some members of the class volunteer with comments and answers; others are chosen by the teacher. Many in the class are involved as the discussion continues until the end of the period.

12:29 The bell rings as discussion of the last sentence ends. The T then says, "before we leave, I'd like to recognize [here, she names two students] who placed in the spelling bee. Will you represent us again today?" One of the students replies, "No, I'll make a fool of myself." The T responds, "Oh no you won't. I thought you were great!" She adds that two other members of the class are also going to spelling bee. The reluctant student concedes, "All right, I'll try." The class cheers. The teacher adds a word of encouragement and dismisses the class.

Day 2

11:45 An assembly has caused the class to miss a meeting since Day 1. Nevertheless, the group picks up with the topic they were addressing during the last meeting.

As on Day 1, students enter the room, immediately get their books, and engage in a period of sustained silent reading. Simultaneously, the T takes attendance and completes other business. Toward the end of the silent reading time, the T distributes a sheet and directs the students to "complete this sheet about the page you are reading." The sheet apparently requires students to answer questions about their silent reading books; they seem to know what to do with it. They also seem to recognize that it signals the end of their silent reading for the day.

11:50 Without further ado, the teacher gives a new workbook page to the students in front, who quietly pass it back. It is another list of word clusters to be arranged in sentences. As these are distributed, the T explains: "We're going to do this aloud this time. As soon as you think you have figured out one of the sentences in your head, raise your hand."

11:51 Hands begin to go up throughout the room. The T calls these students' names one at a time, asks which word group they have made into a sentence, and directs the student to write his or her sentence on the board. Nine sentences in all are thus put on the board.

11:57 Review of the sentences begins with the T choosing a class member and asking, "Is number one correct? [The sentence is "The fire started in the garage.]" Student: "Yes." T: "How do you know? What did you check for?" Student: "Capitalization, end punctuations, and if it makes a complete sentence." T: "What else did you check for?" The student does not answer, but after a pause another volunteers, "Spelling." The T replies, "Right, even though I did not want you to speak without being recognized."

The arrangement of the remaining eight word groups into sentences is checked in the same manner, with the same, detailed consideration and whole-group contributions of the previous lesson. The class is orderly and involved throughout. Occasionally, the teacher calls on students to correct the oral grammar and pronunciation they use as they comment on the sentences in the exercise.

12:07 The task completed, the T continues by addressing the class

about the value of the work they have done: "Now, about what I learned today. You know, we learn things constantly, no matter how old we are. Today, we had a visiting speaker from [a corporation], and he said that many people are overlooked for jobs because they speak poorly. They use slang and colloquial language -- yeah, naw, and so on -- and bad grammar -- I seen, etc. This is especially true of Blacks and Spanish-speaking Americans. Another problem we have is correct and complete pronunciation of words. For example, we'll say "axe" for ask." A student speaks up, "Ms. _____, we don't talk like that." T: "Please. I said we have this problem. I meant that generally. As a race of people, we often speak that way. How often have I corrected someone when I've heard them use the words "he be," "they bes," "she be," and so on."

As the teacher continues, the students begin to ask questions about the relevance of grammar in job interviews and also about appropriate appearance and dress in the business world. The T responds to these, emphasizing that having the requisite skills is the most important factor in winning a job but pointing out that meeting standards of speech, dress, etc. matters as well. All the while, the students pay close attention.

12:12 Concluding the discussion, the T turns to the next segment of the lesson. This is devoted to work on a composition entitled "A Significant Elder" that the students are working on. She chooses and reads two student compositions anonymously, explaining by way of introduction, "These, I thought, were really good." After each, she calls on class members to describe the significant elders in the compositions (in each case, a grandmother.) This serves to produce a wide range of adjectives which the students can use in revising their own drafts.

12:19 When discussion of the second composition has ended, the teacher directs students to join with their previously assigned partners, to "read your paper aloud to the other person and then correct for errors." Students quickly and quietly form their groups and begin this task. Meanwhile, the T moves about the room prompting individual students with questions that highlight spelling errors, syntax errors, and organizational weaknesses in their compositions.

12:35 The students are still working on the composition revisions when the bell rings. The teacher waits until they have rearranged their chairs in a neat order, then dismisses them with the reminder, "Don't forget to bring your books tomorrow. Have a nice day."

EXAMPLE NO. 2: A TEACHER WHO SEEMED TO BE "AVERAGE"

Introduction:

The following illustrates what many would judge as "average" teaching, at least in terms of the 48 teachers observed this year.

The class of 25 Chapter 1 seventh graders is working on both grammar and literature. On the first day of observation, their focus is subject-verb agreement. On the second, they identify subjects, verbs, adjectives and adverbs, then go on to read a short story and answer some questions about it.

Throughout these lessons, an orderly learning environment is for the most part maintained. Instruction unfolds in a reasonably logical manner. The tasks -- working on subject-verb agreement, recognizing parts of speech, and answering comprehension questions about a short story -- seem appropriate for the students' level of achievement, judging from their responses to the teacher's questions. In the test on the story, students are challenged not only to recall story facts, but also to draw inferences based on what they have read.

As in a great many lessons observed, however, discrete skills are taught in isolation. The teacher follows text materials without elaboration, supplement, or innovation. The focus seems somehow to be on completing class assignments and tasks, rather than upon learning to read, write, and speak. No rationale for the tasks is given; no connection is made between these particular skills and the larger competencies of which they are a part. The teacher and class participate with little demonstrated enthusiasm. While the students clearly struggle at several points, the teacher offers only minimal encouragement and commendation.

A great deal of time is spent in non-interactive seatwork and in "going over" material. There is little questioning or discussion to promote understanding of why the correct answers are right or of how one arrives at the correct answers. The students remain rather passive throughout; they are required to do very little thinking. In Example No. 1, the heart of instruction lies in the interactive analysis, examination, and correction of work students have done. Here in Example No. 2, instruction is apparently construed as doing exercises and correcting them.

THE LESSONS

Day 1:

8:05 As the class begins, the teacher (T) directs the students to begin work on an assignment that is listed on the board. It consists of twenty sentences printed in a Warriner's grammar exercise. The task is to choose, from among two verbs given in parentheses, the one which agrees with the subject. The students begin working quietly. The T and an aide (A) begin to move throughout the room, looking on as the students do the exercise. From time to time, a student raises a hand with a question. The A or T moves to the youngster's seat and talks quietly with him or her.

8:20 After fifteen minutes of this quiet seatwork, the T says, "Okay, I'm going to ask everyone to stop for a moment. There are many extemporaneous words, uh, extra words which the use of the word will throw you off. Let's go through a few of them together." The teacher then reads the first sentence in the exercise the students have been working on, and some raise their hands. The dialogue unfolds as follows. T (naming a student): "What is the noun in the first sentence?" S: "Doesn't." T: "No, that's the verb." The T calls on another S. S: "Mother," T: "That's correct. What is the noun in number two?" She calls on three students in succession who answer, "her," "her mother," and "shop." The T responds in each case that the answer is incorrect. She calls for another volunteer, but there are none. Finally, she gives the correct answer, "many."

The teacher then turns to the board, diagrams the sentence, and explains that the assignment is asking for the simple subject and simple verb. She adds that "you can look at all the sentences in terms of a diagramming of the simple subject and the simple verb." The students look on quietly during this explanation.

The class returns to considering each of the assigned sentences in turn.

Students continue to raise their hands to volunteer answers, six or eight per sentence. The T calls on a volunteer, who in each case names a subject and verb. Sometimes their answers are brief, e.g., "Their and are." Sometimes they are delivered in complete sentences: "Each is the subject and knows is the verb." Six of the 20 sentences are completed in this manner.

8:35 When the sixth is done, the T directs, "At this point I want you to write only the word which agrees with the simple subject [instead of writing the entire sentence with the verb choice, which the students have been doing.] Everyone look at the words in parentheses. I want you to write only one of those words, the one which agrees with the subject." The T encourages the group to "move a little faster," then asks if everyone understands the assignment. No questions are forthcoming, and the students promptly return to the assignment, working individually at their seats. Simultaneously, the aide moves to work with one student while the T goes back to moving about, glancing at students' papers, and speaking with individuals who raise their hands.

8:42 "Everyone stop now and exchange papers with someone near you," directs the T. The students do so. "We're going to start on this side of the room. Everyone will take one," the T explains. Immediately, the students begin to take turns reading the correct verb choice for each sentence, proceeding in the order of seating. When a student occasionally reads the incorrect alternative, the T calls on a volunteer for the correct one. The students generally read very softly, prompting the T to read the last five sentences with the appropriate subject-verb agreement.

8:51 Upon completing review of the exercise, the T asks, "How many got them all right?" No hands appear. "How many missed five or less?" Six hands are raised. "Okay," the T concludes, "put the number right at the top of the paper."

8:52 The bell rings, and the T directs, "Okay, everyone take a break." [Here, the students have a "block" schedule, taking three different classes -- English, reading, and social studies -- with the same teacher during successive periods.]

Day 2:

8:10 Homeroom has run late on this, the second day of observation. As the class opens, the T explains the students' first assignment. She directs them to section off a sheet of paper into columns labeled "Subject," "Verb," "Adverb," and "adjective." Their task is to identify these parts of speech in exercise sentences from Warriner's grammar text, then to write five sentences of their own and (again) identify the relevant parts of speech. With some student questions to be answered, the directions take the first eight minutes of the class.

8:18 Concluding the directions, the T points out, "You may not find all these parts of speech in every sentence, but we all know every sentence must have what?" A student volunteers, "Subject." T: "And what?"

Several students call out "verb" or "predicate." The T adds, "Yes, and usually an adjective also." Then she tells the class to begin work on the assignment.

The class begins their task and continues to work on it quietly. From time to time, some speak to one another in low voices, apparently helping one another. The T, circulating through the room looking on and answering questions, does not comment upon such talk when it occurs. Stopping by one table, she remarks, "If you get at least half done, you get to take a break today."

8:50 Students and teacher have been engaged in the parts-of-speech, seatwork assignment for about 30 minutes when the bell rings. The T directs the students to take a break before this three-period, "block" scheduled class recommences.

8:56 The class reassembles with the T seated at her desk. Without further reference to the grammar assignment, the T shifts the students' attention to a reading assignment that they have previously begun. T: "Yesterday we read and discussed [the story] 'That's What Happened to Me.' Which was about what, [names a student]?" The student called on replies, "They were bagging on him." T: "Instead of being part of the group, he was the joke of the group." The T goes on to ask what the main character bragged about and, after a student answers correctly, "What conclusion did you draw based on the facts about his ability to do the things he said?" Several students offer responses to this question, which the T accepts. Next, she poses another "what conclusions can you draw" question, but no student offers to respond to it. After a brief pause, the T announces the next activity as follows.

9:10 "You're going to be answering some questions about the story. You can use scratch paper, any kind. Number 1 to 6. All you need to write is the letter of the answer only. You need to listen very carefully." Students noisily get out the required paper, some borrowing from others. The T waits for a moment for the students to prepare, then begins the test.

The test consists of three parts of six questions each. All three parts are multiple choice and delivered by the T orally as she sits at her desk. The questions are taken verbatim from the workbook which accompanies the students' reading anthology.

The first part covers vocabulary words found in the story read yesterday. The T reads a word, uses it in a sentence, then reads off two choices for its meaning. Such words as merchandising, eliminate, and surrounded are included.

9:17 After completing the six vocabulary questions, the T tells the class, "Number one through six again. Try to recall some detail facts which took place in the story she read." She proceeds to read the six questions, e.g., "Bottles had to work after school in (a) a drugstore or (b) a laundry"; "For the high jump Bottles had the bar set at (a) 6 feet,

(b) five feet." The six questions all require literal recall of story details. The class answers each one with dispatch.

9:22 Beginning the third and last test segment, the T states, "Number one through six again. We are all going to apply some of the reading skills that we all know so well." A few students moan and groan in response, but it soon becomes quiet throughout the group. The six questions require students to draw inferences, for example: "Although the story was written to a humorous way, it shows a serious side in (a) acceptance and approval of others; (b) a chance to prove what he/she can do; or (c) a situation of doing the impossible."

9:50 The test completed, the T directs members of the class to trade papers. They do so and proceed to correct them. The T reads each question; students respond chorally by calling out the answer they consider correct. Most of the students seem to know all the answers.

9:55 "Put the number correct at the top and pass the papers forward," says the teacher. The students follow these directions. A bell rings, and the class ends.

EXAMPLE NO. 3: A TEACHER WHO SEEMED INEFFECTIVE

Introduction:

The lessons below illustrate what several on the research team interpreted as very bad teaching. Another seventh grade Chapter 1 English class, the first day's activity is devoted to taking a spelling test and a vocabulary test. A "word hunt" assignment from Scope magazine is also planned, but the class never gets to it. On the second day of observation, the teacher has just returned from a field trip as the class period begins, but the teacher does not come to the classroom.

The first day's lesson manifests some unwise planning decisions. The teacher has scheduled three, successive episodes of non-interactive seatwork, two of which (the tests) presumably call for considerable, extended concentration on the students' part. This seems inappropriate for the students' developmental level, and especially inappropriate for this group of restless, active youngsters. In addition, one can question the teacher's separation of vocabulary and spelling. A better choice would appear to be working with one set of words and requiring the students to learn both their meaning and spelling. It should be noted, too, that the vocabulary test is multiple choice. A teacher with higher standards and expectations might well have required students to be able to construct the meanings of the vocabulary words, rather than to merely recognize them.

Most obviously, however, the teacher fails to maintain a classroom environment conducive to learning. Students are boisterous throughout much of the period; some are even insolent. As a result, a considerable amount of time is wasted. The teacher and students are consistently distracted from the task at hand. The short vocabulary quiz consumes far more time than it should.

What is more, the teacher's remarks suggest that she has given up on the students. As she begins to collect homework, she seems to have conceded that many will not have it. On several occasions, she expresses pessimism about students' behavior (and indirectly about her own efficacy): "I have enough trouble just getting you to sit and act like students . . ." She eschews positive reinforcement in favor of criticism ("Why aren't you talking now? You had so much fun during class time?") and blunt commands ("Shut up, Arnold"). All of these practices work to create a very negative classroom environment. Furthermore, she follows up very inconsistently on the directives she constantly issues, and sometimes she reinforces inappropriate behavior by responding to or bickering with the students who engage in it.

All in all, the result is a poorly planned and executed class, conducted in a negative, disorderly environment. It marks one extreme of the scale of teaching quality observed in the 48 classrooms. Fortunately, there were not many classes like it.

THE LESSONS

Day 1:

2:10 As the bell rings signaling the start of class, only four students are seated. Six others are just coming into the room. Many are not yet present. The T remarks, "I have these form letters here just waiting to be sent home. One tardy gets a letter for detention and six, a suspension." Over the next several minutes, students continue to enter in ones and twos. Ultimately, 18 of the 29 students enrolled appear.

2:12 The T continues, "Take out your spelling words and pass them to me. If you don't have them, don't tell me about it. I don't want to hear your excuses because it's supposed to be here." Some students from another class arrive and, going to the teacher's desk, proceed to discuss procedures for a field trip that the teacher will chaperone the following day. As the teacher speaks with them, the class is very noisy. Some students are walking around the room talking and playing; others are chatting at their seats.

When the T finishes discussing the field trip, she reprimands one student who is not seated, then walks around to each student's desk, picking up the spelling homework from those who have it. The noise level drops only slightly.

2:14 As the T carries the homework papers to her desk, a student approaches her and says, "I don't mean to call you a liar, but you lied to me yesterday." In a forceful tone, the T tells him, "Sit down!" The student attempts to continue the conversation, but the T cuts him off. "Sit!" she repeats. Then, without further comment she turns to the class and begins a spelling test by stating the first word: "Number one: belief." Most students are unprepared for the test to begin. One calls out: "Wait a minute!" The T replies: "You're supposed to be ready. Number two: shadow."

The T continues giving the spelling words, pronouncing each and using it in a sentence. She continues this procedure for the next six minutes. Meanwhile, the class has yet to settle down completely. One student, for example, is cleaning out his notebook. Another is applying nail polish. Neither is making any effort to take the test. The T interrupts her presentation of the spelling words to reprimand each. Soon, a student begins to make loud grunting sounds. The T calls to him sharply, "Be quiet! I have two young ladies just waiting to escort you down [to the office]." The student replies that he doesn't see any two ladies, only one.

2:22 The teacher concludes giving the spelling words and tells the group, "look at your papers as I go over them again." A student asks her to say them "a little slower this time." The T replies that she will and begins to repeat each word. Another student calls out, "Is that what you call slow?" in an unpleasant tone. The T ignores him and continues repeating each word on the test. Then, she directs the class to "pass up your papers." Five students have no papers to pass in. They have spent the past several minutes moving around restlessly in their seats, banging pens on their desks.

As the tests are collected, the T distributes yet another test, this one a vocabulary quiz. Again, she does not announce the test to the class, although the agenda (which mentions both tests) is listed on the front chalkboard.

2:25 The start of the vocabulary test is delayed as a student requests a pass to go to the office to report that he was "threatened today," as several students exchange harsh words in a disagreement, and as another calls out loudly "Can we write on this test?" When the T answers "Yes," the student calls back, "You didn't let us write on it before!" The T then explains that she has "enough copies this time." Finally, she begins the test. The class is still restless and noisy.

The vocabulary test is printed on the sheet that has been passed out, and it is in multiple choice form. A word is given, together with six possible definitions. By way of explaining directions, the T reads the first word [inherit] and the six alternative answer choices aloud, She

adds, "(f) acquire, is the answer, so write f beside number one, and do the same for all the other words." Upon completing these directions, the T moves to her desk and sits down.

The class remains boisterous as the vocabulary test begins. There is constant movement throughout the room as students tap pens on desks, turn about and talk to neighbors, etc. A student leaves his seat to sharpen his pencil and is soon involved in an altercation with a classmate, who accuses him of throwing something. The two students who came in earlier to talk about the field trip are still present, standing by the T's desk. Two more students have arrived to discuss the trip, giving the teacher a set of papers to look over; they also wait by her desk as she examines the papers.

The T occasionally looks up and reprimands a few of the many students who are talking or fooling around. They often respond with insolent remarks, e.g., T (to a student who is talking loudly): "Arnold, shut up!" S: "You're very rude for a teacher."

2:35 The vocabulary test continues in the same noisy environment. The T is still seated at her desk. One student, referring to a program in which outstanding students are recognized by being selected to teach a class, calls out "Why aren't there any student teachers in this class?" The T replies, "Because I have enough trouble just to get you sitting and acting like students, let alone being a teacher." The student who several minutes earlier accused the T of lying to him begins to reassert, "You lied yesterday." The T says nothing in response. Another student approaches the desk, converses with the teacher, and is reprimanded. "I don't appreciate your talking to me that way either!" He continues complaining as he sits down, but the T is now dealing with another youngster who has come to her desk to request a pass to leave the room. Soon thereafter, she begins writing a disciplinary referral for the complainer, who arises and walks out of the room when he sees the T writing it.

2:41 The test is still in progress; the room is still noisy; the T is still at her desk. Now she is trying to work out whether a student who has just come in with a note does in fact belong in this class. "You're in my period two," says the teacher. "No I'm not. I'm in here," the student insists. Their exchange continues until the T sends the student to a counselor.

2:43 The majority of the class is now working more calmly and quietly on the vocabulary test, but perhaps a third of the group is still talking, doodling, and so on. One of the latter has what looks like a camera, which he points toward the T. The T tells him, "Put that camera away and do your work." Another student tells the teacher that it isn't a camera, that is squirts water. The T demands that the student bring it to her. He refuses. The T sends him to the office.

Over the next fifteen or so minutes, class activity continues in the same vein. Students continue to work on the vocabulary test in an atmosphere

that is quieter than earlier in the period, but still generally restless. Individuals still move about the room, engaging in behavior unrelated to the task at hand. Students continue to call out to the teacher ("She took a white bag that belongs to my friend!") and to approach her desk with forms to be signed, for passes, etc.

The agenda listed on the board suggests that the T had planned another activity for the class: "Word Hunt -- Write answers only, p. 13, Scope Magazine, Volume 34." Somehow, the class never gets to this. The vocabulary test remains the only work for the rest of the period.

2:59 As the period nears its end, the T compliments one student: "I'm glad I have students like Lucinda. She did everything just as she should have."

3:00 The bell rings. Students jump to their feet. The T, however, calls out, "Sit down. You know you don't go until I say so." The T individually dismisses two students who are seated and quiet. The remaining members of the class are perched on their seats anxiously; there is giggling and talking. After several minutes, the T tells another student that he may leave.

3:09 The remaining students are allowed to leave the classroom.

Day 2:

On the second day of observation in this classroom, the teacher was not present as the class began, although she had assured the researcher that she would be back from the fieldtrip in time for his period.

The researcher entered the room and waited for a time, then decided to check with the office.

The researcher then reports: "As I left the main office en route [back] to the room, I noticed the teacher standing in the school's foyer talking with someone. I did not interrupt her conversation because I thought that she, too, was en route to her classroom. I proceeded to the room [and waited.] As I waited, I began my observation with the anticipation of the T arriving soon to take over the class. Unfortunately, this was a poor assumption on my part."

The T never arrived for the class, although she was noticed passing the doorway of her classroom.

The substitute teacher covering the class quickly established order and gave the students a reading assignment following the regular teacher's agenda, which was listed on the board and labeled as identical for an earlier period and this one. Students took turns reading aloud in a story from Scope magazine entitled "Stranger with my Face." The reading went smoothly, without disruption, for the entire period.

APPENDIX B: Training Manual

Training Manual

I. Training for Interviewing

A. Background Reading:

Qualitative Interviewing," in M. Patton, Qualitative Evaluation Methods (Chap. 7) pp 195-254

B. Developing the Structured Interview Schedule

Topic: The Nature of Chapter 1 Services in Junior and Senior High Schools

Conjoint development and sequencing of questions. EPT/Dist. Staff

C. The Walk-Through

District Staff & EPT go through the final version of structured interview schedule in order to be sure that all interviewers agree on (1) exactly what information is to be obtained by each question and question sequence, and (2) how questions and follow-up probes are to be asked (common style).

D. Simulated Interviews for Training

District staff role plays the interview with EPT and/or others serving as interviewers. The goal is to emphasize basic interviewing "Do's and "Don'ts" in context of actual interviews.

E. Arranging and Conducting Practice Interviews

District staff interviewers identify appropriate respondents to be interviewed, schedule, and conduct practice interview. (Ideally, interviewers should choose a respondent with whom they are acquainted and feel comfortable, as well as one who occupies an appropriate junior or senior high position). Interviews are tape-recorded to facilitate critiquing; interviewers also take notes.

F. Critiquing the Practice Interviews

District staff meet with EPT, play tape recordings of their practice

interviews. EPT members critique their interviewing skills in a supportive, constructive way, highlighting "Do's" and "Don'ts".

G. Practicing the Interview Write Up

District staff are asked to write up two accounts of the practice interview: (1) one using only the notes they took during the interview, and (2) another using their notes plus the tape recording of the practice interview.

H. Critiquing Note-Taking and Write-Up Skills

In meeting(s) with the EPT, District staff share their interview accounts. Accounts compared with interview notes, and the tape-recording of the interview for accuracy, comprehensiveness, and critical detail. Notes are compared with the tape-recording for these same features. Note-taking and write-up skills are critiqued in a constructive way toward the improvement of both.

I. Follow-Up and Continued Training Through Initial Interviews

District staff interviewers tape record the first two or three actual interviews to allow for further critiquing of their interviewing, note-taking, and write-up procedures. Group meetings of EPT and District staff team members provide occasions for further review and development of skill in these procedures.

J. Periodic "Brush'Up" Sessions [Optional].

All interviewers, especially beginners, can benefit from periodic review and discussion of their skills by others. Thus, as seems necessary or desirable, District staff interviewers will tape record an occasional interview for use in gaining feedback from District colleagues or EPT members on their interviewing: note-taking, and/or write-up skills.

II. Training for Observing

A. Background Reading

"Observing Ethnographically" in D. W. Dorr-Bremme, An Introduction to Practical Fieldwork from an Ethnographic Perspective

Other, supplementary articles will be distributed as appropriate throughout the training process.

B. Discussions of Observation, Observation Note-Taking, and Observation Write-Up Procedures and "Rules of Thumb" (including review of observation write-ups gathered throughout earlier project).

C. Simulated Observations for Training

District staff conduct observations of videotaped classroom interaction and/or of interaction among other members of the EPT-District research team. Notes are taken and reviewed to emphasize "Do's" and "Don'ts" of effective ethnographic observing and note-taking.

D. Arranging and Conducting Practice, On-Site Observations

District staff members identify an appropriate setting in which to conduct a practice observation, schedule, and conduct it. (Ideally, they should select a setting in which the teacher or other key participant is an acquaintance with whom they feel comfortable, as well as a setting which is relevant to delivery of compensatory services in a junior or senior high.) They observe an entire unit of activity (e.g, a lesson, tutorial, etc.) and take notes on what they observe. Then, they do a narrative write up of the activity observed.

E. Critiquing the Practice Observations

District staff share their rough observation notes and observation

write-ups with one another and with members of the EPT in group meetings. Discussion focuses on the accuracy and comprehensiveness of their rough notes and the write-ups, pointers for strengthening observation, note-taking and write-up skills are discussed.

F. Follow-Up and Continued Training in Observation

When District staff conduct and write-up their initial two or three observations in the course of the actual study, EPT members review their rough notes and final write-ups' critiquing them as in "E" above.

As necessary, periodic checking following similar procedures occurs through the course of the study, to help observers maintain their skills.

III. Training in Ethnographic Field Noting

The previous two sections (I and II) include training for taking notes in the context of focused data collection, i.e., during scheduled interviews following interview forms and during observations centered on particular instructional events. District members of the research team, however, will also have occasion to record general observations, informal conversations that occur on site, as well as their impressions of "what is going on" in the setting.

Skills in ethnographic field noting of this type are introduced at appropriate points in the course of the inquiry, using as models field notes collected in the earlier study. The identification and thorough description of "key incidents" is emphasized. Training in these skills builds on the training provided in focused observation of instructional events described under II above.

ENCLOSURES

CHAPTER 1 INTERVIEW PROTOCOL

School Name _____

Interviewee(s) _____

Position(s) _____

INTRODUCTION

As I explained, I'm an advisor for the Chapter 1 Research and Evaluation Unit. We plan to do a study of teaching practices in Chapter 1 secondary schools. But first, as background, we need to get a very general idea of how Chapter 1 programs are organized in junior and senior high schools. My interview with you will help us to do that.

We're interested in how things actually are in the schools; we are not at all interested in compliance with Chapter 1 guidelines and requirements. That is not part of our study.

Please understand that neither you nor your school will be identified in the study; our talk will be completely confidential. All information will be reported anonymously.

As part of the training process we're all participating in, I'll need to tape record our talk today. Only our research group will be listening to the tape; no one else, in the district or elsewhere, will ever hear it. After it is used for training, the tape will be erased. Now, with your permission I'd like to start the tape, check that it's working, and begin our conversation.

I. SCHOOL DEMOGRAPHY

First, I'd like to ask a few questions about the students and staff at your school.

Can you tell me:

The total number of students enrolled here _____.

The total number of students in Chapter 1 _____.

The approximate number or percentage of LEP students _____

The total number of teachers _____.

The total number of other certificated personnel _____.

The total number of classified personnel _____.

II. BACKGROUND INFORMATION ON RESPONDENT(S)

Okay. Now it would be helpful for me to know something about your role(s) in the Chapter 1 program here.

Chapter 1 responsibilities:

Respondent #1: _____

Respondent #2: _____

Respondent #3: _____

Years in current position _____

Years teaching _____

Teaching subject field _____

CHAPTER 1 INSTRUCTIONAL PROGRAM

- III. That's a very helpful overview of your school and your responsibilities. Now, I'd like to ask a few questions about the Chapter 1 program. As you know, Chapter 1 programs can vary a great deal from place to place, depending on a variety of factors.

In general, what is the number one goal for your school's Chapter 1 program?

Probe as necessary:

- Can you be more specific?
- That seems to be a broad description of the purposes (the activities) of Chapter 1 in general. Within that framework, does your school have a more specific goal?

- IV. Now, following up on that . . .

What is the instructional focus of your Chapter 1 program?

Probe as necessary:

- Within that general focus, are there particular skills, concepts, etc. that you're focusing on?
- Are there particular teaching strategies you're using?
- I know that the school proposal (A-127) planning process encourages you to cover many areas in teaching Chapter 1 students. But within all that, does your school have a particular instructional focus or emphasis this year?

Continuing on . . .

A. Are there variations between grade levels in the instructional focus of your Chapter 1 program?

B. Does the instructional focus of your Chapter 1 program differ in any way from the rest of the instructional program here at _____ school?
(If so, how does it differ?)

- V. Now, with that in mind, let's move on to talk about what your Chapter 1 program looks like.

More specifically, I'd like you to walk me, step by step, through a typical Chapter 1 student's school day, starting with Period 1 and going period by period. Tell me what I'd see if I were there.

Probe as necessary:

- Do Chapter 1 students participate in a pullout program? (Elaborate How does that work?)
- Can you clarify (review) the subject areas in which Chapter 1 operates?
- Can you detail for me what the students experience (in that class, etc.?)

Now, that's given me an excellent picture of the program!
Just for clarification and review,

- A. Would you contrast the differences in the instruction received by a Chapter 1 student and a nonChapter 1 student?
- B. In a slightly different vein; are there differences between a Chapter 1 and a non-Chapter 1 student's extra-curricular activities?
- C. And finally, how often are your Chapter 1 students evaluated or reevaluated for inclusion in the program?

VI. The next set of questions focus on the people who provide Chapter 1 instructional services here at _____ school.

Approximately how many teachers would you say are involved in providing instruction in the Chapter 1 program?

(Ask the next probe only if some number less than the entire teaching staff is given.)

A. Would you say that these teachers are different from the other teachers in terms of:

- years of teaching experience?
- their educational level?
- any special training they may have?
- any other characteristics?

B. How were the teachers chosen for the Chapter 1 program?

C. How many other certificated personnel provide Chapter 1 services?

- what are their roles?

D. How many instructional aides provide Chapter 1 services?

- E. Are there any other personnel (TA's, etc.) who help provide instruction to Chapter 1 students? (If so, about how many?)

VII. CHANGES IN THE SCHOOL'S INSTRUCTIONAL PROGRAM

Finally, we'd like to give you an opportunity to tell us what you would do to improve the Chapter 1 instructional program here at your school. If you could change anything at all, what would you change and why?

Probe once: Anything else?

Those are all the questions I have today. Your responses have provided me with information that will be helpful in further developing plans for this study of Chapter 1 practices at the secondary level. Thank you.

5/28/85
Revised

DIRECTIONS: SCHOOL AND DEPARTMENT CHAIR CONTACT

1. Make appointments to contact English Department chairs and Chapter 1 Coordinators in the schools we have selected, following procedures we have worked out. MEET FIRST WITH CHAIR, THEN MEET WITH COORDINATOR AND REPEAT PROCEDURE.

2. When you meet with the Chair, give the introductory explanation verbatim or very near verbatim. --even if you have previously explained the purpose of your visit in arranging the appointment.

3. Record the Chair's comments and reactions throughout the conversation. These data will be important in selecting a final set of schools to visit.

4. If Chair is reluctant to list teachers, use the prompts (next page) before giving up. The prompt strategy you use will depend upon your judgment of the reason for the Chair's reluctance. (Detach prompts; keep them handy on site.)

5. If the chair finally declines, be sure to ask whether he/she can suggest someone else who can provide the information requested.

6. If and when the Chair agrees to help, follow procedures listed under "The Task," page 2, verbatim. It is important that we say the same thing in speaking with each Chair.

7. Encourage the Chair to take some time to think about the choices. IF HE/SHE WISHES TO GIVE YOU THE NAMES RIGHT OFF, THAT'S FINE BUT DO NOT ALLOW THE CHAIR TO TELL YOU WHICH TEACHERS ARE "OUTSTANDING" AND WHICH ARE "AVERAGE!"

8. If Chair says there are not three "outstanding" teachers, tell the Chair to list only one or two, as appropriate BUT THEN HAVE THE CHAIR LIST THE SAME NUMBER OF AVERAGE TEACHERS.

9. Conclude by being sure you have what you came for: (1) the list of top and average teachers; (2) the daily class schedules of each of those teachers; (3) an indication of which of those classes are predominantly Chapter 1 students (if all are not).

10. The Write Up:

- (a) Recopy your rough notes, including context information, neatly on lined paper.
- (b) Add to the "list sheet" the school name, R's name & position, date, and your name.
- (c) Put "list sheet" on top, then teachers' schedules, then your notes, and staple.

Prompts for Reluctant Respondents

IF R IS CONCERNED ABOUT JUDGING TEACHERS OR ABOUT CONFIDENTIALITY:
Remind R that no one will be told that he/she suggested any teachers at all and/or that no one will have any way of knowing which teachers on the list are considered outstanding and which average.

IF R SEEMS CONCERNED ABOUT POSSIBLE DISRUPTIONS OF TEACHERS' CLASSES OR BURDEN OF THE STUDY: Remind R that choices of which teachers to visit have yet to be made; that classroom visits will take place only with teachers' permission; that we did a similar study in the elementary grades and teachers and administrators found that it did not disrupt their classes or routines.

IF R IS CONCERNED WITH HOW TEACHERS WILL BE SELECTED: Explain that the selection process will be conducted in several phases, and that it will take into account a variety of factors. These will include school demography (location, kinds of students served), as well as nominations, reviews or detailed descriptions of several lessons (to be done "blind"), and other considerations.

SCHOOL CONTACT PROTOCOL FOR
ENGLISH DEPARTMENT CHAIRS AND CHAPTER 1 COORDINATORS

Introductory Explanation:

(Introduce self and give affiliation as appropriate)

[As I explained on the phone] I'm part of a group working on a District-sponsored study of effective teaching practices in junior highs with Chapter 1 programs. It's not an evaluation. What we want to do in the end is to describe really excellent teaching in junior high English classes that serve predominantly Chapter 1 students. We want to be able to say to teachers and administrators in the District, "Here is what really effective English teachers do in teaching Chapter 1 students, and here is how that compares to what the average teacher does."

We're in the early stages of the study right now -- it will continue into next year. At this point, we're simply hoping to identify a pool of top English teachers who work with Chapter 1 students and also some who qualify as "average" English teachers. Later on, we'll be narrowing the pool down, visiting teachers' classes (with their permission), and describing their teaching in detail.

So, I was hoping that you'd be able to help us build our pool of teachers: that you would suggest -- without letting me know which is which -- several outstanding and "average" English teachers here in your department. Of course we'll keep the list confidential. If we do decide we want to visit them, we'll simply explain that we're visiting some teachers at various Chapter 1 junior highs, which will be true.

I'd very much appreciate it if you'd help me out.

(ALLOW RESPONSE - - RECORD REACTIONS)

IF CHAIR AGREES - proceed as with tasks; next page.

IF CHAIR DEMURS - use appropriate prompts;
record reactions
ASK WHO ELSE MAY BE ABLE TO HELP

SCHOOL CONTACT PROTOCOL FOR
ENGLISH DEPARTMENT CHAIRS AND CHAPTER 1 COORDINATORS

The Task

That's great; it will be a big help!
All I need, then, are two things:

(1) GIVE SHEET TO CHAIR.

(You may want to take a few minutes to give this some thought. I can come back and pick this up in fifteen or twenty minutes if you want.)

First, I'd like you simply to list here, in no particular order and without any identification as to which is which, your three top (most outstanding) teachers and three teachers you'd consider "average."

The only limitations are that in each case they need to be teachers who teach at least one period with a class that is largely Chapter 1 students -- and we ask that you don't include among the average teachers any who are really having difficulties or weak in their skills.

(2) Then, the only other thing I'll need is a schedule of each teacher's classes -- and some indication of which classes include mostly Chapter 1 students.
This is just in case we do decide we'd like to visit one of their classes.

(DETERMINE HOW TO GET SCHEDULE AND INDICATION OF CHAPTER 1 CLASSES.)

CONCLUDE WITH: I want to thank you for your help and also to let you know that we'd like to get another point of view on these same issues. We recognize that you're the best source on all this, but I hope you'll be comfortable with my asking the same questions of the Chapter 1 coordinator.

RESPONSE FORM

DIRECTIONS:

(1) Please list below, in no particular order and giving no indication which is which:

(a) your three Top (or most outstanding) English teachers of Chapter 1 students.

(They need not teach only Chapter 1 students, but at least one class that includes a predominantly Chapter 1 group).

(b) three other teachers that also teach at least one predominantly Chapter 1 class, and who you consider to be "average" teachers.
